



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,999	01/16/2001	Janet Arlie Barnett	RD-28,556	6045
6147	7590	04/22/2004	EXAMINER	
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY GLOBAL RESEARCH PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59 SCHENECTADY, NY 12301-0008			EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	6
		2157		

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/760,999	BARNETT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hussein A El-chanti	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4.5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to application filed on Jan. 16, 2001. Claims 1-30 are pending examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 7, 10-21, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jerger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,321,334 (referred to hereafter as Jerger).

Jerger teaches

As to claims 1 and 25, Jerger teaches a method and a computer-readable medium for managing a user community, comprising:

defining a set of user attributes for each user in the user community (see col. 3 lines 9-15); and

identifying a permission level for managing each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 16-26).

As to claim 2, Jerger teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein each permission level defines administrative operations that an administrator can and cannot perform on a user attribute (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claim 3, Jerger teaches the method according to claim 1, further comprising defining restricted values that an administrator can assign for the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 4, Jerger teaches a method for managing user information associated with a user community, comprising:

defining a set of user attributes from the user information for each user the user community (see col. 3 lines 9-15);

identifying a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 16-26); and

managing the user attributes according to each of the permission levels (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 7, Jerger teaches a method for enabling an administrator to control administration of a user community, comprising:

providing user information associated with the user community to the administrator (see col. 3 lines 9-15);

prompting the administrator to define a set of user attributes for each user in the user community (see col. 3 lines 16-26);

prompting the administrator to identify a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 16-26); and

using the identified permission levels to control administration of the user information (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claims 10 and 21, Jerger teaches a user community administration tool for managing user information associated with a user community, comprising:

a domain definition component and means that defines the user community into at least one administrative domain (see col. 3 lines 9-15 and col. 17 lines 1-55),

the domain definition component comprising a user group specifying component that specifies at least one arbitrary group of users from the user community and a user attribute definition component that defines a set of permissible user attributes for the at least one arbitrary group of users (see col. 3 lines 16-26); and

an information management component and means that manages the user information associated with the administrative domain in accordance with the permissible user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 11, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 10, wherein the user attribute definition component comprises an attribute permission component that specifies a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

Art Unit: 2157

As to claim 12, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 11, wherein each permission level defines operations that an administrator can and cannot perform on a user attribute (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claim 13, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 10, wherein the user attribute definition component comprises an attribute restricted value component that defines restricted values that an administrator can assign for any of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 42-57).

As to claim 14, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 10, further comprising an administrative privileges component that grants administrative privileges for the administrative domain (see col. 3 lines 42-57).

As to claim 15, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 14, wherein the administrative privileges component delegates the granted administrative privileges for the administrative domain (see col. 3 lines 27-57).

As to claim 16, Jerger teaches a system for managing user information associated with a user community, comprising:

a database directory containing a plurality of user information (see col. 14 lines 27-42);

a user community administration tool to manage the plurality of user information in the database directory; the user community administration tool comprising a domain definition component that defines the user community into at least one administrative

domain, the domain definition component comprising a user group specifying component that specifies at least one arbitrary group of users from the user community and a user attribute definition component that defines a set of permissible user attributes for the at least one arbitrary group of users; and an information management component that manages the user information associated with the administrative domain in accordance with the permissible user attributes; and a first computing unit configured to serve the user community administration tool and the database directory (see col. 3 lines 9-67) .

As to claim 17, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 16, further comprising a second computing unit configured to execute the user community administration tool served from the first computing unit over a network (see col. 3 lines 9-41).

As to claim 18, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 16, wherein the user attribute definition component comprises an attribute permission component that specifies a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 19, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 18, wherein each permission level defines operations that an administrator can and cannot perform on a user attribute (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claim 20, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 16, wherein the user attribute definition component comprises an attribute restricted value component

that defines restricted values that an administrator can assign for any of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 28, Jerger teaches a computer-readable medium storing computer instructions for instructing a computer system to enable an administrator to control administration of a user community, the computer instructions comprising:

providing user information associated with the user community to the administrator (see col. 3 lines 9-15);;

prompting the administrator to define a set of user attributes for each of the users in the user community (see col. 3 lines 16-26);;

prompting the administrator to identify a permission level for each of the user attributes; and using the identified permission levels to control administration of the user information (see col. 3 lines 16-26);.

**3.** Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 22-24, 26, 27, 29 and 30 do not teach or define any additional limitation over claims 1-4, 7, 10-21, 25 and 28 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

**4.** The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Frame-Based Knowledge Representation System And Methods by Atman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,442,566.

• Application/Control Number: 09/760,999  
Art Unit: 2157

Page 8

- Method And System For Managing Multiple Lightweight Directory Access Protocol Directiry Services by Byrne et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,490,619.
- System For Displaying A Computer Managed Network Layout With Transient Display Of User Selected Attributes Of Displayed Network by Tarbox et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,664,987.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hussein A El-chanti whose telephone number is (703)305-4652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hussein El-chanti

April 7, 2004

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SPECIALIST PATENT EXAMINER  
INDUSTRY CENTER 2100